

Academic Studies in FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Editor : **Dr. Yunus Dogan**



Educational

ISBN: 978-2-38236-042-2



9

782382

360422



LIVRE DE LYON



livredelyon.com



livredelyon



livredelyon



livredelyon



LIVRE DE LYON

Lyon 2020

ACADEMIC STUDIES
IN
FOREIGN LANGUAGE
EDUCATION


Editor
Dr. Yunus Dogan



LIVRE DE LYON

Lyon 2020

Editor • Dr. Yunus Dogan

 **ORCID** 0000-0002-5038-3404

Cover Design • Aruull Raja

First Published • December 2020, Lyon

ISBN: 978-2-38236-042-2

© copyright

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the publisher's permission.

The chapters in this book have been checked for plagiarism by  intihal.net

Publisher • Livre de Lyon

Address • 37 rue marietton, 69009, Lyon France

website • <http://www.livredelyon.com>

e-mail • livredelyon@gmail.com



PREFACE

The field of foreign language learning and teaching has literally received an exponential attention together with the ever-increasing number of language learners throughout the world. In the meantime, rigorous research on foreign language education has been yielding fruitful outcomes in terms of bringing to light particular facts about how individuals learn a non-native language; however, the scholarly quest in this discipline is an ongoing endeavour teaching us new things with each research study. This book, in this sense, attempts to make a contribution to the field by providing insights into certain research subjects of foreign language education in the light of recent relevant literature.

Dr. Yunus Dogan

CONTENTS

PREFACE.....	I
REFEREES.....	V
Chapter I C. Atar & S. Walsh & P. Seedhouse	
TEACHERS' NONVERBAL BEHAVIOR IN REPAIR INITIATION: LEANING FORWARD AND CUPPING THE HAND BEHIND THE EAR	1
Chapter II Y. Dogan	
EFFECT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM ANXIETY ON TURKISH EFL LEARNERS' ONLINE LEARNING ANXIETY	21
Chapter III M. P. Babanoglu & R. Agcam	
SUSTAINABILITY IN COMPULSORY ENGLISH CURRICULA FOR PRIMARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION: COMPETENCIES AND COMPONENTS.....	37
Chapter IV P. C. S. Dayananda & O. E. Yapar	
ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTIONS OF LEARNER AUTONOMY: A CASE STUDY AT A STATE UNIVERSITY IN SRI LANKA.....	59
Chapter V Y. Dogan & M. Tuncer	
THE ROLE OF ATTITUDES IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNING.....	83

REFEREES

Prof.Dr. Murat Tuncer, Fırat University, Turkey

Assoc. Prof.Dr. Veli Batdı, Gaziantep University, Turkey

Asst. Prof. Dr. Cihat Tatar, Sakarya University, Turkey

Asst. Prof. Dr. Hakkı Bağcı, Sakarya University, Turkey

CHAPTER I

TEACHERS' NONVERBAL BEHAVIOR IN REPAIR INITIATION: LEANING FORWARD AND CUPPING THE HAND BEHIND THE EAR*

Cihat Atar¹ & Steve Walsh² & Paul Seedhouse³

²(Asst. Prof. Dr.); Sakarya University, e-mail: cihatatar@sakarya.edu.tr



ORCID 0000-0002-5879-3432

³(Prof. Dr.); University of Newcastle upon Tyne, e-mail: steve.walsh@newcastle.ac.uk



ORCID 0000-0003-4524-7827

⁴(Prof. Dr.); University of Newcastle upon Tyne,
e-mail: paul.seedhouse@newcastle.ac.uk



ORCID 0000-0002-0099-3167

INTRODUCTION

Repair in conversation can be defined as “efforts to deal with trouble sources or repairables marked off as distinct within the ongoing talk” (Schegloff, 2007, 101). The term repair is used to describe the situations in which there is an attempt to deal with a trouble source at a specific moment in interaction. Troubles in interaction stem from mainly three sources: hearing, understanding and acceptability problems (Svennevig, 2008; Schegloff, 2007). Therefore, repair is an interactional tool which interlocutors use to address and handle problems in speaking, hearing and understanding. Schegloff et al. (1977) argue that repair sequences allow the interlocutors in a conversation to handle a breakdown or a trouble by revision or adjustment, and they suggest that the repair mechanism is essential for successful exchange of information in interaction. Accordingly, it can be argued that repair sequences restore mutual understanding by equalizing the known information, and this makes the repair mechanism an essential tool in achieving intersubjectivity.

In second/foreign language classrooms, teachers also other-initiate repair when they feel that the information is not correct, there is lack of

* This article has been written as an elaboration of the Doctorate Thesis ‘Atar, C. (2016). The Sequential Organization and Management of Teachers’ Other-Initiation of Clarification in Second Language Classroom Contexts’ accepted by University of Newcastle upon Tyne, the UK.

enough information, or when they consider a student's turn to be problematic because of institutional and pedagogic goals (Seedhouse, 2004). In this respect, the use of repairs is essential in managing interaction in classrooms.

INTERACTIONAL COMPETENCE

Interactional competence can be defined as interlocutors' use of linguistic and interactional resources according to the contexts where they are utilized (Young, 2008). In the literature there is much discussion on the nature of interactional competence (Markee, 2008; Pekarek Doehler, 2010; Young, 2008), but space precludes a full discussion of them here and as a result, Markee (2008) will be mentioned here which is the one followed in this study. The reason why it was chosen is that Markee focuses on second language interaction, and he has operationalized the concept of interactional competence successfully via the three components he suggested. These components consist of the formal system, the semiotic system, and gaze and paralinguistic features. The formal system is made up of pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar while the semiotics system consists of turn-taking, sequence organization and repair mechanism. The final one which is the focus of this study involves gaze and paralinguistic features. Interactional competence is constructing interaction in a moment by moment fashion with reference to local needs in interaction. In this sense, nonverbal behaviors are the interactional moves interlocutors utilize to achieve intersubjectivity. By asking for repair through nonverbal behavior, teachers aim at clarifying the problems. Accordingly, in the following paragraphs the types of nonverbal behaviors used to initiate and manage repairs will be discussed in relation to the ones observed in the data of this study.

NONVERBAL PHENOMENA IN REPAIR

Communication may take various forms, and one of them is oral/spoken. However, when people interact, they generally do not limit themselves to the use of words only. "They also use their hands, (gestures), head moments, eyes (eye contact), lips (smile), bodily postures and symbols to communicate which always accompany oral discourse-intended or not. The impact of these nonlinguistic cues in conversation is called nonverbal communication" (Negi, 2009, 101). According to Negi (2009), nonverbal communication has some functions such as substituting, complementing, regulating and contradicting the verbal message. Substitution is when the nonverbal behavior can mean something without any verbal prompts.

Nonverbal behavior is found to be an interesting area, and there have been many studies on it in different contexts (e.g. Goodwin, 2003; Kendon, 2004; Morris, 1994). However, the role of nonverbal behavior in

second/foreign language classrooms has only been studied recently with the increase of interest in multimodality in L2 classrooms (Cho & Larke, 2010; Gulberg, 1998; Kupetz, 2011; Mortensen, 2012, 2016; Negi, 2009; Rasmussen, 2014; Seo & Koshik, 2010; Sert, 2017; Tellier, 2010). For instance, Rasmussen (2014) studied leaning forward, and the findings of this study suggested that leaning forward combined with utterances contributed to better interaction. In her data, Rasmussen found that leaning forward is used in repair turns. Balaman (2017) found that leaning forward is used by teachers for nomination in pre-schools. The teachers would use it as a part of several resources (e.g. crouching, shifting posture and walking toward the students) including cupping the hand behind the ear to initiate a student response. In these instances, there is not a problem, but the teacher uses it as an embodiment to show that it is that specific student's turn to talk. Pan (2014) also suggested that leaning forward can be a resource for teachers to help students contribute via showing interest. These observations on cupping the hand behind the ear were also reported by Mortensen (2016). He suggested that this move indicates hearing problem when it is stand alone; however, when there is verbal repair initiation, it indicates that there is not a hearing problem. This is in line with Balaman (2017) who suggested that cupping the ear with hand accompanies verbal prompts, and this leads to a nomination for a student to respond. Feshbach (1967, 8) also observed that the teacher in the study used cupping her ear as a way to ensure that students "listen" to her when she asked questions. However, it should be noted that the context was a reading class, and it was in the first language.

Seo and Koshik (2010) studied gestures that engender repair in English as a second language classrooms. One of the gestures they found is a head poke forward accompanied with a movement of the upper body forward towards the recipient, which we call leaning forward in our analysis in line with Rasmussen (2014). Seo and Koshik (2010) found that this nonverbal phenomenon is quite salient in their data, and it engenders repair. This means that it is understood to be initiating repair. As for the sequential position of the gestures, they suggested that they were initiated in the transition-relevance place following the trouble source, and they were maintained throughout the following turns until the problem was clarified. The fact that they were used at a specific point and in a successful way indicates that this is a part of teachers' interactional competence.

Silence has also been found to have some functions and meanings in interaction. One of the significant findings about silence, especially significantly long silence (2 or more seconds), is that it signals a problem or a dispreferred response (Liddicoat, 2011). For instance, researchers such as McHoul (1990) and Macbeth (2004) found that if there was a teacher silence after a student response, this indicated that the student's answer is

a dispreferred one. However, regarding silence as an indicator of dispreferred response is not the sole interpretation. Pomerantz (1984) and Kääntä (2010), for example, argued that unlike first language interaction, silence and response delays do not necessarily indicate a dispreferred response in second language interaction. In line with these studies, Walsh (2011) also suggested that teacher silence, which he calls wait-time, is an interactional strategy that teachers use to give students more time to prepare and talk. Maroni (2011) also supported this suggestion, and it was found that teachers' wait-time increases student turn length and participation.

To sum up the discussion, as the literature review shows, studies on nonverbal behavior that accompanies speech are common; however, conversation-analytical studies focusing on nonverbal phenomena that can initiate repair on their own is very rare (Taleghani-Nikazm, 2007; Olsher, 2004; Seo & Koshik, 2010), and most of them do not focus on the observations in this study, which are leaning forward and cupping the hand behind the ear. Accordingly, the focus of this study is leaning forward that can initiate repair without any verbal prompts to contribute to the gap in the literature. Cupping the hand behind the ear will also be demonstrated as it accompanies leaning forward in repair sequences. This case is a very interesting observation in that a nonverbal phenomenon can work as a repair initiator, and the interlocutors orient to it as a repair initiation from an emic perspective. In this sense, this is a unique case, and the current study will elaborate on the findings of the PhD thesis by Atar (2016) through focusing on a sub-research question of the thesis that was not published previously. Accordingly, the research question is:

1) How do leaning forward and cupping the hand behind the ear contribute to repair initiation as nonverbal behavior?

METHODOLOGY

This is a qualitative and descriptive study that aims to describe a phenomenon from a conversational-analytical perspective. Conversation Analysis (CA) is a naturalistic approach, and it aims at observing, describing, analyzing and understanding interaction as an essential component of human social behavior (Sidnell, 2010). CA initially focused on L1 interaction. Later, studies on institutional talk and L2 classrooms have also gained popularity. The idea of having an unmotivated look at the data is an indispensable part of the CA analysis. Unmotivated looking is studying a data without having prior aims, and this is in contrast to rationalist and deductive approaches that start the analysis with pre-defined categorizations or concepts. Hence, this study will describe an interesting finding observed in the data as a case study.

CA emerged from sociological studies, and it was founded upon the ethnomethodology of Goffman and Garfinkel, who studied members of a society and their practices to understand how they interact as social beings (ten Have, 2007). In his studies, Garfinkel tried to figure out how ordinary people achieve their interactional goals in everyday life. Similarly, Goffman is the pioneer researcher in studying human interaction in close detail (Gardner, 2004). These two researchers were the pioneers, and Harvey Sacks and Emanuel A. Schegloff undertook CA studies in the early 1960s. Via their studies, CA became a distinct discipline, and it turned into a naturalistic approach whose primary aim is to observe, describe, analyze and understand talk as a basic component of human social behavior (Sidnell, 2010).

CA is different than other approaches such as Chomskyan approaches as it specifically emphasizes interaction (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984). CA mainly focuses on interaction rather than the language itself. There is a significant focus on interaction in CA; because, as Schegloff (1986, 112) put it, talk is primarily “the primordial site of sociality”. Interaction and talk are utilized at every stage of the life of human beings, and they are vital tools in human activities from daily conversation to formal encounters. Hence, it can be suggested that according to conversation-analytical perspectives, interaction is the activity by which human beings share their social experiences and fulfill their socially-oriented goals.

Considering the issues discussed above, in this study the data comes from genuine L2 classrooms. There is no outside intervention on variables, and the classrooms were recorded naturally. Secondly, to uncover the nonverbal behavior and what they achieve, the instances were observed via the emic perspective of CA. The initial observations showed that teachers and students created and oriented to the nonverbal moves as an initiator of repair. Consequently, in accordance with the premises of CA, this study aims at uncovering the order and organization of the two practices of teachers’ nonverbal behavior as repair initiation: leaning forward and cupping the hand behind the ear.

THE CONTEXT AND PARTICIPANTS

In CA studies, data and participants are chosen from authentic contexts. This is called the specimen approach which is methodologically in contrast to the factist perspective. In the factist perspective a representative sample must be chosen to represent the whole population (Alasuutari, 1995). However, in the specimen perspective, participants or contexts are studied as a reality in their natural context. In this sense, the specimen approach is a representation of the reality which is more appropriate for the purposes of this study as the aim of this study is to

understand the nonverbal behavior as they occur in real second language classrooms. Newcastle University Corpus of Academic Spoken English (NUCASE) data is suitable for this aim as it includes data from natural classroom contexts. As a result, second language classrooms in NUCASE were chosen to study how the participants in these classes initiated and managed repair via nonverbal behavior.

The participants in the data were international students studying English to proceed to their degrees. They were studying in either foundation, English for university study or graduate diploma programs at the time of data collection. The classrooms were made up of around 10 students. They were mostly from China or the Middle East. Their level of English was CEFR B1 or B2. CEFR B1 and B2 correspond approximately to the IELTS band range 6. This is nearly an upper-intermediate level. As for the teachers, there were 4 teachers who were all native speakers of English, and 3 of them were males while only 1 of them was a female.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

Transcription is the process of creating the orthographic representation of the data. Transcription is a very significant part of CA analysis as it is the initial step in converting the data into a format by which micro analysis can be undertaken (Liddicoat, 2011). The transcription conventions suggested in Liddicoat (2011) and Seedhouse (2004) were synthesized, and a consistent transcription system was developed for this study (see Appendix A). It is really essential to have a consistent transcription system in a study as it not only ensures a reliable representation of the data, but also allows readers and other researchers to understand the extracts easily. This, naturally, increases the reliability and validity of a study.

As for data collection, the data consists of eight classroom hours of data chosen from NUCASE. They were video-recorded in 2015. They come from second language classrooms in a higher education context. As the focus is on improving academic English, usually lessons are initiated and led by the teacher and then there are tasks and discussion sessions to be completed by students in small groups. At the end of the tasks, teachers typically have a whole class discussion and evaluation. The original study, the PhD thesis by Atar (2016), consisted of twelve classroom hours of data; however, as some of it were audio-only, they were inappropriate for doing analysis on nonverbal aspects of language. Consequently, 8 hours of multimodal data were selected for analysis.

As for the amount of data needed for a sound CA study, Seedhouse (2004) suggested that five to ten hours of classroom data are considered to be adequate for second language classroom studies, and he claimed that

these data are enough for making generalizations and drawing conclusions from a specific context. Hence, eight hours of data in this study is sufficient for obtaining sound results for this specific case study. As this study is undertaken on the data taken from the NUCASE database, permissions from the university, teachers and participants had already been obtained. Consequently, the data collection was on a voluntary basis. All the participants were told that the data would only be used for this study and their identity would be kept confidential. In order to ensure confidentiality, the names of teachers and students were referred to as T for teachers and S1, S2 and so on for students.

AS for data analysis, the data were analyzed according to the suggestions of Seedhouse (2004), who provided a framework to undertake CA systematically. Seedhouse (2004, 38-39) suggested the following steps for a sound data analysis in CA:

- Unmotivated look at the data
- An inductive search throughout the database to establish a collection of instances of the phenomenon
- Establishing regularities and patterns in relation to the occurrences of the phenomenon in order to show that these instances are produced and oriented to by the participants as normative organization of the action
- Finally, a more generalized account of how the phenomenon relates to interaction in the broader sense is produced

The data were analyzed in accordance with these steps, which will be presented in the next section.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of the data indicated that both leaning forward and cupping the hand behind the ear were observed to indicate a hearing problem. Leaning forward can engender repair initiation alone while cupping the hand behind the ear accompanies verbal moves and leaning forward. As for the sequential position, they follow a students' problematic turn but after a silence of a few seconds. So, the student produces a problematic turn, a few seconds lapse and then the teacher uses one of these nonverbal phenomena to indicate that there is a problem. The following two extracts will demonstrate these findings in more detail below.

Extract 1 demonstrates leaning forward as a nonverbal phenomenon that can engender repair on its own. It is a significant observation in that it clearly shows the contribution of nonverbal behavior in repair initiation: The nonverbal behavior can initiate a repair without any utterances. In this extract, the teacher and students discuss how to find solutions to unhealthy diet of children. The students first do discussion in small groups

and then the teacher initiates a whole class discussion. The context of this extract is a meaning and fluency context (Seedhouse, 2004), and the focus is on the discussion of the ideas about solutions to children's unhealthy eating habits.

Extract 1.2.1 (44:50-45:01) Malls

1 S6 : er: in our countries where (.) all: we
 2 have is (malls)
 3 (1.0)
 4 T : ((*leans forward*))
 5 S6 : [er: >malls< like the [ones (you shop)
 → T #1 #1 #1 #2
 6 S7 : [>what?<
 7 S? : [this thing is,
 8 S? : malls
 9 T : malls? (.) shopping malls >sorry yes<
 10 S6 : yeah: ((*she continues talking about malls*))



#1



#2

In lines 1 and 2, S6 initiates a turn and mentions malls. She says that there are malls everywhere, but there are not enough sport facilities for children. However, there is one second pause following S6's turn, and in line 4 the teacher leans forward. In the following line S6 quickly repeats (>malls<), and then she tries to explain it by (like the [ones (you shop))). Just before the completion of this turn, in line 6 the teacher stops leaning forward and comes back to normal posture. He acknowledges the repair by (malls? (.) shopping malls >sorry yes<) in line 10. In line 11 S6 says (yeah:) to indicate that it is the word she has said, and she goes onto making her argument about malls.

In this extract the teacher's leaning forward in line 4 demonstrates that this nonverbal behavior works as a repair initiation and indeed, it can itself other-initiate a repair. The occurrence of this nonverbal resource on its own is understood as a repair initiation by S6 as evidenced from her trying to repair her previous turn. The analysis shows that leaning forward is found to accompany (sometimes it comes a few seconds prior to the repair-initiation and continues to accompany the verbal repair-initiation) nearly half of the instances of repair initiation that aims at clarifying a hearing problem. The instance above in the extract is; however, a seldom one (observed only twice). But, it clearly illustrates the role of nonverbal behavior in repair initiation.

Extract 1 has illustrated that leaning forward can itself other-initiate repair and Extract 2 will demonstrate how it can initiate a repair accompanied by cupping the hand behind the ear after verbal initiation. In this extract there is a discussion on the topic of the listening that the students have listened to.

Extract 2_3.1 (39:26-39:44) The challenges

1 S12 : (also) the challenges
2 (1.4)
3 T : that's right (.) the challenges of the
4 environmental: ,
5 (1.9)
6 S12 : er (0.9) (civilizi?)
7 T : >say again<
→ T #3 #4 #4
8 (1.3)
9 S12 : the challenges of er whole civilizah
 T #4 #4 #4 #5
10 T : yeah (.) >yeah< (.) ((nods)) yeah.



#3



#4



#5

In line 1, S12 mentions challenges as a response which is followed by a silence of 1.4 second. In the next lines (3-4), the teacher wants S12 to expand his previous turn with a designedly incomplete utterance (Koshik, 2002). Following a silence of 1.9 second, in line 6, S12 tries to provide an answer, but he cannot pronounce the word civilization. Consequently, the teacher orients to it as a problem as significantly long silences may be an indicator of trouble (Liddicoat, 2011; Pomerantz, 1984). This is supported by the fact that she firstly leans forward and slightly moves hand to ear (this occasionally accompanies leaning forward as seen in screenshots 3 and 4) and then she immediately other-initiates a repair in line 7 with (>say again<), which suggests that there is a trouble in interaction. This is accompanied by her leaning forward and cupping her right hand behind her ear, and this continues throughout S12's self-repair of his previous turn in line 9. Once S12 finishes the repair, the teacher also stops leaning forward as seen in screenshot 5, and she stops cupping her hand behind her ear. Finally, in line 10 the teacher produces an acknowledgement of S12's response (the challenges of civilization) with (yeah (.) >yeah< (.) yeah.).

This extract demonstrates how leaning forward, sometimes together with cupping the hand behind the ear, accompanies repair initiation. In this

extract it slightly precedes repair initiation, and this is similar to the previous extract in that the teacher first does the nonverbal behavior. However, unlike the previous extract, leaning forward and verbal initiation together other-initiate a repair. One point that may be mentioned here is that although the student cannot pronounce the word civilization properly in the second attempt either, the teacher ignores it, and she does not initiate an error correction. This is probably because of the sub-context of that moment as the focus is on meaning in that task. Therefore, when the teacher understands the word, she does not focus on the mispronunciation in line with the pedagogic focus (Seedhouse, 2004).

Considering the analysis, it may be argued that in line with Seo and Koshik's (2010) study in second language classroom settings, leaning forward is quite salient in this context as well, and it engenders repair in a specific sequential environment. As demonstrated in Extract 1, leaning forward is so salient that it can other-initiate repair on its own without any verbal utterances. Therefore, it can be argued here that leaning forward has a significant role in repair initiation when the problem impeding mutual understanding is a hearing problem. As for the sequential organization, Seo and Koshik (2010) observed that leaning forward was initiated in the turn transition space following the trouble source, and they were maintained throughout the following turns until the problem was clarified. This finding is in line with the analysis of this study, and this is clearly demonstrated in screenshots #1, #2, #3 and #4.

The salient nonverbal behavior observed to engender repair alone in this data is leaning forward. It does not only accompany some repair initiation turns (Extract 2), but also it can itself work as a repair initiator as discussed in Extract 1. This finding is in line with Seo and Koshik's (2010) study in that the nonverbal behavior alone is understood to be initiating repair. This is a very significant finding and observation demonstrating the importance of nonverbal behavior in interaction. In the literature, Rasmussen (2014) argued that leaning forward combined with utterances contributes to better interaction. In her data Rasmussen found that leaning forward was used in the repair phases, which is also supported by Seo and Koshik's (2010) findings. But, in our study, leaning forward is commonly observed to occur in the repair-initiation phase. Still, Rasmussen's (2014) point is valid for our analysis as leaning forward physically embodies meanings in interaction. Hence, the findings of this study suggest that nonverbal phenomena are an essential part of the repair mechanism.

In line with Negi's (2009) suggestion about the functions of nonverbal behavior, the finding that leaning forward can itself initiate a repair can be seen as the "substitution" aspect that he mentioned. In this instance, the nonverbal behavior itself works as a repair initiator, which is a very rare and unique observation especially as a part of the repair

mechanism. Hence, it is “substituted” for the meaning (i.e. initiating a repair for a hearing problem) via embodiment.

As for the causes of the trouble source that leaning forward and cupping the hand behind the ear aim to solve, it is observed in the data that it is a hearing problem in both cases. This has been exemplified in the extracts. As seen in Extract 1 and 2, the students made self-correction via repetitions and slight revisions, which suggests that they considered it as a hearing problem. This finding is in contrast with Seo and Koshik (2010), who suggested that leaning forward is generally perceived as an understanding problem. This was seen in the responses of the students in their study. The students sometimes responded by reformulating and correcting the possible trouble source, which showed that they understood the nonverbal behavior as an understanding problem. This difference between the two studies may be due to the fact, as they stated in their study, students’ language competency was an issue in Seo and Koshik (2010). However, as mentioned in the Methodology part, the participants in this current study had a relatively higher competency level. Accordingly, owing to the proficiency issues, leaning forward might have been used for understanding problems more in Seo and Koshik’s study (2010). Pan (2014) suggested that leaning forward was used for showing interest to students’ contributions; however, this observation was not found in the current study.

Balaman (2017) suggested that cupping the hand behind the ear accompanied by leaning forward is used for nomination in pre-schools; however, this function was not observed in our study. Cupping the hand behind the ear was observed to be understood as a repair initiation for hearing problems, and it sometimes accompanied leaning forward to other-initiate repair (Extract 2). Mortensen (2016) found that cupping the ear with hand indicated a hearing problem when it was stand alone; however, when there was a verbal repair initiation, it indicated that there was not a hearing problem. However, in the current study it was observed to initiate repair for only hearing problems. On the other hand, the finding about cupping the hand behind the ear is in line with Mortensen (2016) and Balaman (2017) considering the fact that it accompanied verbal initiation (Extract 2) unlike leaning forward. Finally, the findings on cupping the ear contrasted with Feshbach (1967, 8), who found that the teacher in that study used cupping her ear as a way to ensure that students “listen” to her when she asked questions. This was not observed in the current study; however, this may be due to the difference in context: the context in Feshbach’s (1967) study was a reading class, and it was in the first language. As it was a first language context, there might have been less hearing problems (due to the lack of second/foreign language learners’

problems of pronunciation and lexical error that could lead to hearing problems) and thus this function may have been observed less or never.

Finally, as for the place of teachers' nonverbal language use as a part of interactional competence, it may be argued that it is a part of interactional competence (Markee, 2008). Leaning forward and cupping the hand behind the ear fit into the third dimension of Markee's (2008) interactional competence framework, which involves gaze and paralinguistic features. These nonverbal phenomena are shown to construct interaction in a moment by moment fashion (i.e. that is at the right moment in a transition relevant place) with reference to local needs. In this sense, these two moves are the interactional moves teachers utilized to achieve inter-subjectivity and pedagogic goals in the data. This is in line with studies such as Seo and Koshik (2010), Hayashi (2005) and Taleghani-Nikazm (2007) that see nonverbal behavior as communicative resources. By asking for repair through/with nonverbal behavior, teachers aim at clarifying the problems. The fact that the two nonverbal behaviors were used at a specific point and in an efficient way by the teachers indicates that this is a part of their interactional competence.

CONCLUSION

This study set out to investigate how leaning forward and cupping the hand behind the ear contribute to repair initiation in an English as a second language context depending on the doctorate thesis by Atar (2016). Conversation Analysis was utilized, and the emic perspective was implemented by focusing on how the interlocutors oriented to the phenomenon. The analysis has shown that leaning forward can itself initiate repair without any verbal prompts, which is a rare observation in the literature. The fact that it makes a self-initiation of repair by the students relevant indicates that they are understood as a repair initiation by the students. In this sense, it is argued here that the two nonverbal phenomena in this study have a systematic organization (as an action and sequentially), and they were oriented to in this way by the interlocutors. These findings have contributed to the literature, and this study has demonstrated the significance of nonverbal behavior in interaction, which is evidenced by the fact that they can even initiate repair alone. Cupping the hand behind the ear has also been shown to contribute to initiating repair via embodiment and accompanying leaning forward. Then, this study adds to the understanding of both conversational repairs in classrooms and the use of nonverbal phenomena as a repair initiation.

This study analyzed only 8 classrooms hours of data. Although this amount of data is reliable and valid in CA studies as mentioned in Methodology, future studies with more data and/or in different contexts can offer insights into how these nonverbal phenomena work under

different circumstances. Also, in the future studies, further bottom-up studies can be undertaken to unearth other nonverbal phenomena that can initiate repair alone. Finally, the students in this study were in a higher education setting and their English level was high. Hence, students/teachers in primary and secondary schools and students with lower English proficiency level can be studied to see the effect of age and proficiency level.

REFERENCES

- Alasuutari, P. (1995). *Researching culture: Qualitative method and cultural studies*. London: Sage.
- Atar, C. (2016). *The sequential organization and management of teachers' other-initiation of clarification in second language classroom contexts* [Unpublished PhD thesis]. University of Newcastle upon Tyne.
- Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (1984). Preference organization. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social interaction* (pp. 53-56). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Balaman, U. (2017). Embodied resources in a repetition activity in a preschool L2 classroom. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 12(1), 27-51.
- Cho, E. H., & Larke, P. J. (2010). Repair strategies usage of primary elementary ESL students: Implications for ESL teachers. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 14(3), 1-18.
- Feshbach, N. D. (1967). Variations in teachers' reinforcement style and imitative behavior of children differing in personality characteristics and social background. *CSEIP Technical Report No. 2*. University of California, Los Angeles.
- Gardner, R. (2004). Conversation Analysis. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 262-284), Blackwell Publishing: Oxford.
- Goodwin, C. (2003). Pointing as situated practice. In S. Kita (Eds.), *Pointing: Where language, culture, and cognition meet* (pp. 217-241). Mahwah: LEA.
- Gullberg, M. (1998). *Gesture as a communication strategy in second language discourse. A study of learners of French and Swedish*. Lund: Lund University Press.
- Kääntä, L. (2010). *Teacher turn-allocation and repair practices in classroom interaction: A multisemiotic perspective*. [Unpublished PhD thesis]. University of Jyväskylä.
- Kendon, A. (2004). *Gesture visible action in utterance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kupetz, M. (2011). Multimodal resources in students' explanations in CLIL interaction. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 5(1), 121-142.

- Liddicoat, A. J. (2011). *An introduction to Conversation Analysis (2nd Edition)*. Continuum International Publishing group.
- Macbeth, D. (2004). The relevance of repair for classroom correction. *Language in Society*, 33(5), 703-736.
- Markee, N. (2008). *Conversation Analysis*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc: 10 Industrial Avenue Mahwah, NJ 07430.
- Maroni, B. (2011). Pauses, gaps and wait time in classroom interaction in primary schools. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 43(7), 2081-2093.
- McHoul, A. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in society*, 19(3), 349-377.
- Morris, D. (1994). *Body talk: A world guide to gestures*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Mortensen, K. (2012). Visual initiations of repair – some preliminary observations. In K. Ikeda & A. Brandt (Eds.), *Challenges and new directions in the micro-analysis of social interaction* (pp. 45-50). Osaka: Division of International Affairs, Kansai University.
- Mortensen, K. (2016). The body as a resource for other-initiation of repair: Cupping the hand behind the ear. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 49(1), 34-57.
- Negi, S. J. (2009). The role of teachers' non-verbal communication in ELT classroom. *Journal of NELTA*, 14(1), 101-110.
- Olsher, D. (2004). Talk and gesture: the embodied completion of sequential actions in spoken interaction. In R. Gardner, & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 221–245). London: Continuum.
- Pan, Q. (2014). Nonverbal teacher-student communication in the foreign language classroom. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(12), 2627-2632.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2010) Conceptual changes and methodological challenges: on language, learning and documenting learning in conversation analytic SLA research. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh, & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising learning in Applied Linguistics* (pp. 105-126). Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action. Studies in*

- Conversation Analysis* (pp. 57-101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rasmussen, G. (2014). Inclined to better understanding: The coordination of talk and 'leaning forward' in doing repair. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 65, 30-45.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1986). The routine as achievement. *Human Studies*, 9, 111-51.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction. A primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation, *Language*, 53, 361-82.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A Conversation Analysis perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Seo, M. & Koshik, I. (2010). A conversation analytic study of gestures that engender repair in ESL conversational tutoring. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 2219-2239.
- Sert, O. (2017). Creating opportunities for L2 learning in a prediction activity. *System*, 70, 14-25.
- Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation Analysis: An introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Svennevig, J. (2008). Trying the easiest solution first in other-initiation repair. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40, 333-348.
- Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2007, October 11-14). *Gestures in foreign language classroom: an empirical analysis of their organizations and functions* [Conference presentation]. The Annual Conference of Second Language Research Forum, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the USA.
- ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing Conversation Analysis (2nd Edition)*. London: Sage.
- Tellier, M. (2010). The effect of gestures on second language memorisation by young children. In M. Gullberg & K. de Bot. (Eds.), *Gestures in language development* (pp. 75-92). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. Oxon: Routledge.

Young, R. F. (2008) *Language and interaction: A resource book*. Oxon: Routledge.